

Multiple M-wave interaction with fluxes

Igor A. Bandos ^{†‡}

[†]*Department of Theoretical Physics, University of the Basque Country EHU/UPV, P.O. Box 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain*

[‡]*IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, 48011, Bilbao, Spain*

(Dated: V1: March 1, 2010. V2: May 14, 2010. **Phys. Rev. Lett.** **105**, 071602 (2010), [het-th/1003.0399](#))

We present the equations of motion for multiple M0-brane (multiple M-wave or mM0) system in general eleven dimensional supergravity background. These are obtained in the frame of superembedding approach, but have a rigid structure: they can be restored from $SO(1,1) \times SO(9)$ symmetry characteristic for M0. BPS (Bogomol'nyi–Prasad–Sommerfield) conditions for the 1/2 supersymmetric solution of these equations have the fuzzy 2-sphere solution describing M2-brane.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Pb, 11.25.-w, 04.65.+e, 11.10.Kk

Supersymmetric extended objects, (super-) p -branes (including string for $p=1$, membrane for $p=2$ and also particle for $p=0$) and interacting systems of several branes play very important rôle in String/M-theory [1] and in the AdS/CFT correspondence [2]. They are used in constructing models of our Universe as a 3-brane or an intersection of p -branes in the space of higher-dimensions. Such *Brane World* scenarios can be developed in the frame of string/M-theory as well as independently of it. The most known examples of the later were the Randall–Sundrum models [3] which then were incorporated in the M-theoretic context in [4].

The most interesting p -branes are $D=10$ fundamental strings and Dp -branes (Dirichlet p -branes), where the fundamental string can have its ends, and $D=11$ Mp -branes with $p=0,2,5$. These can be described by supersymmetric solutions of $10D$ and $11D$ supergravity equations (see [5] and refs therein), by the worldvolume actions [6–9] and in the frame of the so-called superembedding approach [10–15] (see [13] for more refs).

As far as the multiple p -brane systems are concerned, it was appreciated long ago that in the very low energy limit the dynamics of multiple Dp -brane (mDp) system is approximately described by the maximally supersymmetric $U(N)$ super–Yang–Mills (SYM) action [16]. In the search for a counterpart playing the rôle of SYM action for the case of multiple M2-branes, the Bagger–Lambert–Gustavsson (BLG) model [17], based on the notion of 3-algebras rather than Lie algebras, and the 3/4 supersymmetric ($d=3$, $\mathcal{N}=6$) Aharony–Bergman–Jafferis–Maldacena (ABJM) $SU(N) \times SU(N)$ invariant Chern–Simons plus matter model [18] were found.

However in the search for complete supersymmetric, Lorentz and diffeomorphism invariant action for multiple Dp 's (Mp 's), which would be a counterpart of the Dirac–Born–Infeld plus Wess–Zumino action for a single Dp -brane [7, 8] (single Mp [6, 8, 10]) only particular progress has been reached (see [23] for low dimensional and low co-dimensional branes and [22] and [14] discussed below).

The widely accepted purely bosonic Myers ‘dielectric brane action’ [19], which was generalized for the case of multiple M-waves (multiple M0-branes or mM0-s) in [20], does not possess neither supersymmetry nor 10D Lorentz symmetry, nor complete diffeomorphism invariance. The

boundary fermion approach of [22] certainly provides a complete, supersymmetric and Lorentz covariant description of mDp-s, but on ‘minus one quantization level’: the quantization of the auxiliary boundary fermion variables is needed to arrive at a description of mDp systems similar to the description of a single Dp -brane in [7].

To search for a (possibly approximate but going beyond the $U(N)$ SYM approximation) Lorentz and diffeomorphism covariant and supersymmetric equations of the mDp-s, it was proposed [14] to use superembedding approach [10] which had shown its efficiency in searching for the single Dp -brane and single M5-brane equations [11, 12]. It was shown in [14] that the superembedding approach for the mD0 (multiple D-particle) system results in selfconsistent dynamical equations for matrix superfields describing relative motion of the mD0 constituents and that the structure of the bosonic equations in an arbitrary type IIA supergravity background shows the Emparan–Myers dielectric brane effect [21], [19]. In the case of flat superspace the mD0 equations of [14] coincide with the result of dimensional reduction of 10D SYM down to $d=1$, which are the starting equations of the Matrix model of [24]. Then, the question arose whether one could show the restoration of the 11D Lorentz symmetry in this description of mD0, like it was the case for the Matrix model. The affirmative answer on this has been given in [15], where the superembedding approach for mM0 system was developed and used to derive mM0 equations of motion in the case of flat target superspace. The equations describing relative motion of mM0 constituents coincide with the ones for the relative motion in mD0 system in flat 10D type IIA superspace [14]. This, together with the fact that a single D0-brane action can be obtained by dimensional reduction (dualization) of the action for single M0 [8], allowed us to conclude that the mM0 equations obtained from superembedding approach give an equivalent form of the mD0 equations but with restored 11D Lorentz invariance.

In this letter we present the equations of motion for mM0 system *in curved 11D superspace* which describe the mM0 interaction with the 11D supergravity. To our best knowledge, this is the first covariant generalization of the Matrix model equations for the case of nontrivial and not pure bosonic- 11D supergravity background.

1. To fix the basic notion and notation, we begin by a very brief description of *superembedding approach to a single M0-brane* in general 11D supergravity background. This requires the superfield description of 11D supergravity in terms of supervielbein one forms $E^A := dZ^M E_M^A(Z) = (E^a, E^\alpha)$ (with bosonic vectorial form E^a , $a = 0, 1, \dots, 9, 10$, and fermionic spinorial form E^α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, 32$) which satisfy the set of superspace constraints [25] of which the most important fixes the form of bosonic torsion 2-form of the curved 11D superspace $\Sigma^{(11|32)}$ (see [15] and refs. therein for details)

$$T^a := DE^a = -iE^\alpha E^\beta \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a. \quad (1)$$

Here $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a = \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^a$ are 11D Dirac matrices and the exterior product of differential forms is assumed ($E^\alpha E^\beta = E^\alpha \wedge E^\beta$). We have denoted the local coordinates of $\Sigma^{(11|32)}$ by $Z^M = (x^m, \theta^{\tilde{\alpha}})$ ($\tilde{\alpha} = 1, \dots, 32$, $m = 0, 1, \dots, 9, 10$).

The standard formulation of M-branes (Mp-branes with $p = 0, 2, 5$) deals with embedding of a purely bosonic worldvolume W^{p+1} (worldline W^1 for M0-case of [8]) into the *target superspace* $\Sigma^{(11|32)}$.

The *superembedding approach* to M-branes [10, 12], following the STV (Sorokin–Tkach–Volkov) approach to superparticles and superstrings [26] (see [13] for review and further refs) describes their dynamics in terms of embedding of *worldvolume superspace* $\mathcal{W}^{(p+1|16)}$ with $d = p + 1$ bosonic and 16 fermionic directions into $\Sigma^{(11|32)}$. This embedding can be described in terms of coordinate functions $\hat{Z}^M(\zeta) = (\hat{x}^m(\zeta), \hat{\theta}^{\tilde{\alpha}}(\zeta))$, which are superfields depending on the local coordinates $\zeta^{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{W}^{(p+1|16)}$,

$$\mathcal{W}^{(p+1|16)} \in \Sigma^{(11|32)} : \quad Z^M = \hat{Z}^M(\zeta). \quad (2)$$

For $p = 0$ these are $\zeta^{\mathcal{M}} = (\tau, \eta^{\tilde{q}})$, where τ is proper time and $\eta^{\tilde{q}}$ are 16 fermionic coordinates of the *worldline superspace* $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$, ($\eta^{\tilde{q}} \eta^{\tilde{p}} = -\eta^{\tilde{p}} \eta^{\tilde{q}}$, $\tilde{q} = 1, \dots, 16$).

The *superembedding equation* states that the pull-back $\hat{E}^A := d\hat{Z}^M(\zeta) E_M^A(\hat{Z})$ of the bosonic supervielbein form $E^A := dZ^M E_M^A(Z)$ to the worldvolume superspace has no fermionic projection. For the case of M0-brane it reads

$$\hat{E}_{+q}^a := D_{+q} \hat{Z}^M E_M^a(\hat{Z}) = 0, \quad (3)$$

where D_{+q} is a fermionic covariant derivative of $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$, $q = 1, \dots, 16$ is a spinor index of $SO(9)$ and $+$ denotes the ‘charge’ (weight) with respect to the local $SO(1,1)$ group. The only bosonic covariant derivative of $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ is denoted by $D_{\#} := D_{++}$ and supervielbein of $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ by $e^A = d\zeta^{\mathcal{M}} e_{\mathcal{M}}^A(\zeta) = (e^{\#}, e^{+q})$. Notice that in our notation the upper plus index is equivalent to the lower minus, and vice-versa, so that one can equivalently write, for instance, $D_{+q} = D_q^-$ and $D_{\#} = D^-/2$.

The superembedding equation (3) is *on-shell* in the sense that it contains the M0-brane equations of motion among their consequences. We refer to [15] for the explicit form and the derivation of these equations. For the discussion below we will need only few details concerning the on-shell geometry of the worldline superspace

$\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$. In particular, with our conventional constraints (see [15]) the bosonic torsion two form of $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ reads

$$De^{\#} = -2ie^{+q} e^{+q}, \quad (4)$$

the Riemann curvature two form of $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ vanishes, while fermionic torsion De^{+q} and curvature of the normal bundle over $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ are expressed through the following components of the pull-backs of the bosonic and fermionic fluxes (field strengths or curvatures)

$$\hat{F}_{\#ijk} := F^{abcd}(\hat{Z}) u_a^{\#} u_b^i u_c^j u_d^k, \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{R}_{\#ij\#} := R_{dc\,ba}(\hat{Z}) u^{d\#} u^{ci} u^{bj} u^{a\#}, \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{T}_{\#i+q} := T_{ab}^{\alpha}(\hat{Z}) v_{\alpha q}^{\#} u_a^{\#} u_b^i. \quad (7)$$

Here $u_a^{\#}$ and u_b^i are the auxiliary moving frame superfields which obey (notice that $u_a^{\#} \neq u_{a\#} := u_a^{\#}/2$)

$$\begin{aligned} u_a^{\#} u^a = 0, & \quad u_a^{\#} u^{\#} = 0, & \quad u_a^{\#} u^a = 2, \\ u_a^{\#} u^{ai} = 0, & \quad u_a^{\#} u^{a\#} = 0, & \quad u_a^i u^{aj} = -\delta^{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The sixteen 11D spinor superfields $v_{\beta q}^{\#} = v_{\beta q}^{\#}(\zeta)$ in (7) are the spinor moving frame variables which can be considered, roughly speaking, as square roots of the light-like vector $u_a^{\#}$ in the sense of that (see [15] and refs. therein)

$$v_q^{\#} \Gamma_a v_p^{\#} = u_a^{\#} \delta_{qp}, \quad 2v_{\alpha q}^{\#} v_{\beta q}^{\#} = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a u_a^{\#}. \quad (9)$$

Notice that the *equations of motion for single M0-brane* can be expressed by the statement that $v_{\alpha q}^{\#}$ and the light-like moving frame vector $u_a^{\#}$ are covariantly constant, $Dv_{\alpha q}^{\#} = 0$ and $Du_a^{\#} = 0$. Then one finds

$$D_{+q} \hat{F}_{\#ijk} = 3i\gamma_{[ij] \, qp} \hat{T}_{\# \, |k] \, p}, \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{+p} \hat{T}_{\#i+q} &= \frac{1}{2} \hat{R}_{\#ij\#} \gamma_{pq}^j + \frac{1}{3} D_{\#} \hat{F}_{\#ijk} \gamma_{pq}^{jk} \\ &+ \frac{1}{18} D_{\#} \hat{F}_{\#jkl} \gamma_{pq}^{ijkl} + \hat{F}_{\#[3] \, \#} \hat{F}_{\#[3] \, \#} \Sigma_{pq}^{i, [3], [3']}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\Sigma_{pq}^{i, [3], [3']} := \Sigma_{pq}^{i, j_1 j_2 j_3, k_1 k_2 k_3}$ is a constant tensor-spin-tensor obeying $(\Sigma^{i, [3], [3']} \gamma^i)_{qp} = -\frac{1}{6} \delta_{j_1}^{[k_1} \delta_{j_2}^{k_2} \delta_{j_3}^{k_3]} \delta_{qp}$. As a consequence of the Rarita–Schwinger and Einstein equations of the 11D supergravity, the above fluxes obey

$$\gamma_{qp}^i \hat{T}_{\#i+p} = 0 \quad (a), \quad \hat{R}_{\#j\#j} + \frac{1}{3} (\hat{F}_{\#ijk})^2 = 0 \quad (b). \quad (12)$$

2. We describe the *relative motion of mM0 constituents* by the maximally supersymmetric $SU(N)$ YM gauge theory on $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ whose embedding into the target 11D superspace is specified by the superembedding equation (3) [15]. This latter results in dynamical equations which formally coincide with the single M0 equations and thus describes, in terms of coordinate functions $\hat{Z}^M(\zeta) = (\hat{x}^m(\zeta), \hat{\theta}^{\tilde{\alpha}}(\zeta))$, the motion of the center of energy of multiple M0-brane system. The gauge theory is formulated in terms of 1-form gauge potential $A = e^{\#} A_{\#} + e^{+q} A_{+q}$ on $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$. Its field strength $G_2 = dA - A \wedge A = e^A e^B G_{BA}/2$ obeys the constraints

$$G_{+q+p} = i\gamma_{qp}^i \mathbf{X}^i, \quad (13)$$

where $\gamma_{qp}^i = \gamma_{pq}^i$ are nine-dimensional Dirac matrices, $\gamma^i \gamma^j + \gamma^j \gamma^i = \delta^{ij} I_{16 \times 16}$ ($i = 1, \dots, 9$). This constraint involves a nanoplet of $N \times N$ hermitian matrix superfields $\mathbf{X}^i = (\mathbf{X}^i)^\dagger$ the leading component of which provides the natural candidate for the field describing the relative motion of the M0 constituents.

Studying Bianchi identities one finds that the selfconsistency of the constraints (13) requires the matrix superfield $\mathbf{X}^i$ to obey the *superembedding-like equation* [15]

$$D_{+q} \mathbf{X}^i = 4i \gamma_{qp}^i \Psi_q. \quad (14)$$

The set of physical fields of the $d=1$, $\mathcal{N}=16$ SYM model defined by constraints (13) is exhausted by the leading component of the bosonic superfield $\mathbf{X}^i$, providing the non-Abelian, $N \times N$ matrix generalization of the Goldstone field describing a single M0-brane in static gauge, and by its superpartner, the leading component of the fermionic superfield Ψ_q in (14), providing the non-Abelian, $N \times N$ matrix generalization of the fermionic Goldstone field describing a single M0-brane. (which can be extracted from the fermionic coordinate function of M0-brane by fixing the gauge with respect to local fermionic κ -symmetry). To be convinced in that no other fields appear, one can calculate the spinor covariant derivative of the fermionic superfield and find

$$D_{+p} \Psi_q = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{pq}^i D_{\#} \mathbf{X}^i + \frac{1}{16} \gamma_{pq}^{ij} [\mathbf{X}^i, \mathbf{X}^j] - \frac{1}{12} \mathbf{X}^i \hat{F}_{\#jkl} (\delta^{i[j} \gamma^{kl]} + \frac{1}{6} \gamma^{ijkl})_{pq}. \quad (15)$$

3. Equations of motion and polarization of multiple M0 by flux. Studying the selfconsistency condition of Eq. (15) (on the line of [15] but taking into account nonvanishing supergravity fluxes) we find the interacting dynamical equation for the fermionic matrix (super)fields

$$D_{\#} \Psi_q = -\frac{1}{4} \gamma_{qp}^i [\mathbf{X}^i, \Psi_p] - \frac{1}{24} \hat{F}_{\#ijk} \gamma_{qp}^{ijk} \Psi_p - \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{X}^i \hat{T}_{\#i+q}. \quad (16)$$

As usual in supersymmetric theories, the higher components in decomposition of the superfield version of the fermionic equations over the Grassmann coordinates of $\mathcal{W}^{(1|16)}$ give the bosonic equations of motion. In the case of our multiple M0 system these are the Gauss constraint

$$[\mathbf{X}^i, D_{\#} \mathbf{X}^i] = 4i \{\Psi_q, \Psi_q\} \quad (17)$$

and proper equation of motion

$$D_{\#} D_{\#} \mathbf{X}^i = \frac{1}{16} [\mathbf{X}^j, [\mathbf{X}^j, \mathbf{X}^i]] + i \gamma_{qp}^i \{\Psi_q, \Psi_p\} + \frac{1}{8} \hat{F}_{\#ijk} [\mathbf{X}^j, \mathbf{X}^k] + \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{X}^j \hat{R}_{\#j \#i} - 2i \Psi_q \hat{T}_{\#i+q}. \quad (18)$$

The third term in the *r.h.s.* of the bosonic equation (18), $\hat{F}_{\#ijk} [\mathbf{X}^j, \mathbf{X}^k]$, is essentially non-Abelian and typical for ‘dielectric coupling’ characteristic for the Emparan-Myers ‘dielectric brane effect’ [19, 21]. The fourth term is the mass term for $N \times N$ matrix $SO(9)$ vector superfield $\mathbf{X}^j$ with the mass matrix given by the projection of Riemann tensor $\hat{R}_{\#i \#j} (= \hat{R}_{\#j \#i})$ defined in Eq. (6).

4. Actually, using only the $SO(1,1) \times SO(9)$ symmetry of our mM0 system one can not only find all the terms in the *r.h.s.* of Eqs. (16)–(18), but also conclude that only two other contributions might be possible but are absent. The reason beyond this *rigid structure of the multiple M0 equations* is that all the basic superfields and projections of the background fluxes interacting with mM0 constituents carry positive $SO(1,1)$ weights (‘charges’).

Indeed, the $SO(1,1)$ weights are +2 for the bosonic superfield $\mathbf{X}^i := \mathbf{X}_{++}^i$, +3 for the fermionic $\Psi_q := \Psi_{++q}$, and +2, +3 and +4, respectively, for the 11D supergravity fluxes $\hat{F}_{\#jkl} := \hat{F}_{++jkl}$ (5), $\hat{T}_{\#j+p} := \hat{T}_{++j+p}$ (7) and $\hat{R}_{\#i \#j} := \hat{R}_{++i \#j}$ (6). Then, as the covariant derivative $D_{\#} := D_{++}$ has the weight +2, the fermionic and bosonic equation of motion are $N \times N$ matrices with the $SO(1,1)$ weights +5 and +6, respectively. Now, taking into account also the $SO(9)$ index structure of the basic superfields and fluxes, one sees that, if we do not allow ourselves using the inverse and fractional powers of $\hat{R}_{\#i \#j}$ and of matrix superfield $\mathbf{X}^i \mathbf{X}^i$, very few terms can be written in addition to ones already present in (16)–(17). Moreover, all but two of these actually vanish.

Indeed, one could add $\mathbf{X}^i \gamma^{ij} T_{\#j+p}$ to the Dirac equation (16), however this term can be expressed through the already present $\mathbf{X}^i T_{\#i+p}$ using (12a). This equation is also responsible for vanishing, $\Psi_q \gamma_{qp}^j T_{\#j+p} = 0$, of the only possible contribution to Eq. (17), and for that the possible fermionic contribution $\Psi_q \gamma^{ij} T_{\#j+p}$ to Eq. (18) can be expressed in terms of $\Psi_q T_{\#i+q}$ already present there. As far as the pure bosonic contributions to (18) are concerned, the already present terms could be completed by the $\mathbf{X}^i \hat{R}_{\#k \#k}$ and $\mathbf{X}^j \hat{F}_{\#ikl} \hat{F}_{\#jkl}$ (due to (12b), $\hat{F}_{\#jkl} \hat{F}_{\#jkl} \propto \hat{R}_{\#k \#k}$). Thus the only results of the explicit calculations in the frame of superembedding approach are the absence of these two contributions to the mass matrix of the $N \times N$ matrix superfield $\mathbf{X}^i$ and the exact values of the nonvanishing coefficients in (16)–(18).

Such a rigid structure of the mM0 equations (16)–(18), which suggests their universality, comes from $SO(1,1) \times SO(9)$ symmetry of our mM0 system. This originates in that M0-brane is actually the *massless* 11D superparticle the momentum of which is light-like and has a small group which is essentially $SO(1,1) \times SO(9)$ (see [27] and refs. therein for a more precise statement). Such a rigidity cannot be seen from observing the mD0 equations [14] as they are: as D0-brane is a massive 10D superparticle, the (spacial) symmetry of the relative motion of mD0 system of [14] is restricted to $SO(9)$, the small group of the timelike 10D momentum. Thus, to see the rigid structure of mD0 equations [14], one needs to appreciate their 11D origin, *i.e.* their appearance as a result of dimensional reduction of our mM0 equations.

5. The *BPS conditions* for the supersymmetric bosonic solutions of Eqs. (18) and (17) can be obtained from Eqs. (11) and (15). For 1/2 supersymmetric configurations these (1/2 BPS equations) read

$$D_{+p} \hat{T}_{\#i+q}|_0 = 0 \quad (a), \quad D_{+p} \Psi_q|_0 = 0 \quad (b). \quad (19)$$

Eq. (19a) restricts the 3-form flux pull-back to be constant, $D_{\#}\hat{F}_{\#ijk} = 0$, and, up to $SL(9)$ transformations, to have the form $\hat{F}_{\#ijk} = 3/4 f \delta_I^i \delta_J^j \delta_K^k \epsilon^{IJK}$ ($I = 1, 2, 3$). Then Eq. (19b) has the fuzzy 2-sphere solution

$$\mathbf{X}^i = \delta_I^i f T^I, \quad [T^I, T^J] = \epsilon^{IJK} T^K. \quad (20)$$

This configuration was known to solve the pure bosonic equations of [19], but in our case it appears as describing the M2-brane as a supersymmetric configuration of mM0 system, and also the relation of the special form of the flux ($\hat{F}_{\#ijk} \propto \epsilon^{IJK}$) with preservation of 16 supersymmetries becomes manifest. Curiously, the famous Nahm equation $D_{\#}\mathbf{X}^I + \frac{i}{8}\epsilon^{IJK}[\mathbf{X}^J, \mathbf{X}^K] = 0$ [28], which also has fuzzy-two-sphere-related solution, appears as an $SO(3)$ invariant 1/4 BPS condition for the case of *vanishing* 4-form flux pull-back, $\hat{F}_{\#ijk} = 0$.

6. Giving a covariant and supersymmetric description of the Matrix model interaction with nontrivial 11D supergravity fluxes, our approach might provide a new framework for studying M-theory. The first of the promising directions is to search for other supersymmet-

ric solutions of the mM0 equations, representing more complicated M-brane and D-brane configurations.

For the development of our approach it is important to clarify whether our superembedding description can be generalized for multiple Mp -branes and Dp -branes with higher p . An important problem is also to find an action functional for the embedding functions and matrix superfields $\mathbf{X}^i$, Ψ_q which reproduced our mM0 equations. To this end the application of the 'Ectoplasm-like' technique of restoring the action from superembedding approach (see [22] and refs. therein) looks promising. Another challenge is to understand whether one can develop a counterpart of the (string-inspired and hence seemingly ten dimensional) boundary fermion approach [22] for the eleven dimensional multiple M0-system.

The author is thankful to Dima Sorokin, Mario Tonin and Paolo Pasti for the interest to this work and for their warm hospitality at the Padova Section of INFN and Padova University on its final stages. The partial support by the research grants FIS2008-1980 from the Spanish MICINN and 38/50-2008 from Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and Russian RFFI is greatly acknowledged.

-
- [1] C.M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B438**, 109 (1995); E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B443**, 85 (1995); J.H. Schwarz, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **B55**, 1 (1997); P.K. Townsend, *Four Lectures on M-theory*, hep-th/9612121. In: *Summer School High energy physics and cosmology, Trieste 1996* (Eds. E. Gava, et al) World Scientific, 1997, Singapore, pp. 385-438 [hep-th/9612121].
 - [2] J.M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor.Math.Phys. **2**, 231(1998); S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov, A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B428**, 105 (1998); E. Witten, Adv. Theor.Math.Phys. **2**, 253 (1998); O. Aharony, S.S. Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, Y. Oz, Phys.Rept. **323**, 183 (2000).
 - [3] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999); Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4690 (1999).
 - [4] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and K. S. Stelle, J. Math. Phys. **42**, 3027 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0007120].
 - [5] M. J. Duff, R. R. Khuri and J. X. Lu, Phys. Rept. **259**, 213 (1995) [hep-th/9412184]; K. S. Stelle, "BPS branes in supergravity," in: *High Energy Physics and Cosmology 1997* (Eds: E. Gava et al.), Singapore, World Scientific, 1998, pp. 29-127 [hep-th/9803116].
 - [6] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **B189**, 75 (1987).
 - [7] P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **B373**, 68 (1996) [hep-th/9512062]; M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B.E.W. Nilsson, A. Westerberg, Nucl.Phys. **B490** (1997) 163 [hep-th/9610148]; M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B.E.W. Nilsson, P. Sundell and A. Westerberg, Nucl.Phys. **B490**, 179 (1997) [hep-th/9611159]; M. Aganagic, C. Popescu, J.H. Schwarz, Phys.Lett. **B393** (1997) 311 [hep-th/9610249]; Nucl.Phys. **B490**, 202 (1997) [hep-th/9612080].
 - [8] E. Bergshoeff, P.K. Townsend, Nucl.Phys. **B490**, 145-162 (1997) [hep-th/9611173].
 - [9] I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin, M. Tonin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4332(1997) [hep-th/9701149]; M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu, J.H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B496**, 191 (1997) [hep-th/9701166].
 - [10] I. Bandos, D. Sorokin, M. Tonin, P. Pasti, D.V. Volkov, Nucl. Phys. **B446**, 79-118 (1995) [hep-th/9501113].
 - [11] P.S. Howe and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. **B390**, 133 (1997) [hep-th/9607227].
 - [12] P.S. Howe and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. **B394**, 62 (1997) [hep-th/9611008].
 - [13] D. P. Sorokin, Phys. Rept. **329**, 1-101 (2000).
 - [14] I.A. Bandos, Phys. Lett. **B680**, 267-273 (2009).
 - [15] I.A. Bandos, Phys. Lett. **B687**, 258-263 (2010).
 - [16] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B460**, 335 (1996).
 - [17] J. Bagger and N. Lambert, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 065008 (2008); JHEP **0802** (2008) 105; A. Gustavsson, Nucl. Phys. B **811**, 66 (2009).
 - [18] O. Aharony, O. Bergman, D. L. Jafferis and J. Maldacena, JHEP **0810**, 091 (2008) [arXiv:0806.1218 [hep-th]].
 - [19] R. C. Myers, JHEP **9912**, 022 (1999) [hep-th/9910053].
 - [20] B. Janssen and Y. Lozano, Nucl. Phys. **B643**, 399 (2002); [hep-th/0205254]; **B658**, 281 (2003) [hep-th/0207199].
 - [21] R. Emparan, Phys. Lett. **B423**, 71 (1998).
 - [22] P. S. Howe, U. Lindstrom and L. Wulff, JHEP **0508**, 041 (2005); JHEP **0702**, 070 (2007) [hep-th/0607156].
 - [23] D. Sorokin, JHEP **08**, 022 (2001); J. Drummond, P.S. Howe and U. Lindstrom, Class.Quant.Grav. **19**, 6477 (2002); S. Panda and D. Sorokin, JHEP **02**, 055 (2003).
 - [24] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 5112-5128 (1997) [hep-th/9610043].
 - [25] E. Cremmer and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. **B91**, 61 (1980); L. Brink and P.S. Howe, Phys. Lett. **B91**, 384 (1980).
 - [26] D. P. Sorokin, V. I. Tkach and D. V. Volkov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 901-908.

- [27] I.A. Bandos, Nucl. Phys. **B796**, 360 (2008).
- [28] W. Nahm, Phys. Lett. **B90**, 413 (1980).